

15 November 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Logistics

STAT FROM : [redacted]  
Deputy Chief, Printing & Photography Division

SUBJECT : H.R. 4572, Public Printing Reorganization  
Act of 1979

REFERENCE : Memo to D/L from AGC/OGC, dtd. 9 Nov. 79,  
Same subject, (OGC 79-10146)

STAT 1. The Printing and Photography Division (P&PD) responded to [redacted] request for comments as he became involved in drafting a statement of the impact H.R. 4572 would have on the Agency. Subsequently, he forwarded a draft of his "views letter" to us on the amended version of the Bill, H.R. 5424. In our perusal of this latter draft we abided by his request to consider only "major substantive" changes that should be made in the final version of his response to Chairman Hawkins. Consequently, we did not offer any comments.

STAT 2. In essence, we felt that [redacted] was viewing the Bill as it would affect the whole of the Agency's printing facilities, utilizing the macro approach for measuring the Bill's impact. [redacted] position seems to be slanted toward the more narrow view, citing the Bill's impact only on P&PD. We are of the opinion that the macro approach is correct, that NPIC and GAD/OTS facilities certainly should be included in any statement citing the impact the Bill would have on Agency printing facilities. STAT

3. Based on our assumption that the macro approach is correct, there is little doubt, in our opinion, that "the vast majority of printing services....are thus of a highly sensitive nature". Human resources expended by P&PD on unclassified printing amounts to only 25 percent (approx.) of our total. Inasmuch as P&PD is the Agency's printer for nearly all administrative material, it is a reasonable conclusion that the production of this type of work by NPIC and GAD must be minuscule. In this light, [redacted] STAT

"vast majority" statement seems to be most accurate.

STAT 4. [ ] concern about P&PD not having a formal  
document allowing its expansion into "unclassified" printing  
STAT is well taken but we quite often find ourselves at polar  
extremes with [ ] on this subject. We feel that we do have  
authorization documents for this expansion but we do not  
profess to know their legal worth. In any event, the docu-  
mentation has always seemed to be sufficient to fend off the  
numerous queries about our authority in this area. These  
queries into our authority however, had prompted us to point  
out quite clearly, in our response to [ ] that  
STAT we would prefer our position under the Bill to be clarified  
"up front"; i.e., whether the Bill was to affect the P&PD  
operation or not. In essence, we wish to avoid any queries  
pertaining to our authority under the Bill which could come  
back to haunt us in the years to come.

STAT 5. [ ] obviously feels that the Bill, if passed,  
might be interpreted to mean that only classified material  
could be produced on P&PD equipment. We feel that such a  
stance would be contradictory to the "cost savings" intent  
of the Bill. However, simply because the issue has been  
raised and is a matter of concern to [ ] it should be  
STAT included in [ ] proposed changes to Chairman  
Hawkins. Resolution of the matter would help us to avoid  
any misunderstandings on the subject in the future.

[ ]